



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,026	07/26/2001	Gowri Rajaram	UTL 00113	7642
7590 08/25/2005		EXAMINER		
Kyocera Wireless Corp. Attn: Patent Department 10300 Campus Point Drive San Diego, CA 92121			TORRES, MARCOS L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2687	
			DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/917,026	RAJARAM, GOWRI			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Marcos L. Torres	2687			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
THE - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by started the process of the pr	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a replication of the statutory minimum of thirty (3 od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 May 2005</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) T	his action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 33-38 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 33-38 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ r No(s)/Mail Date 12130	Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) //ail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/917,026

Art Unit: 2687

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on December 13, 2004 was considered during the time given to the examiner. If the applicant believes that a particular document is relevant to the prosecution of the case, the applicant is invited to mention the particular document to the examiner.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-10 and 33-38 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 33 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hutchison US 6,449,476 B1.

Regarding claim 1, Hutchison discloses a method for of organizing a wireless communication device system software (see col. 1, lines 8-11) the method comprising: forming the wireless device system software into a plurality of code sections (see col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 6); storing a plurality of code section start address; storing a code

section address table cross-referencing a plurality of code section identifiers with a plurality of corresponding code section start addresses (see col. 6, lines 9-15).

As to claim 4, Hutchison discloses the method of forming the wireless communication device system software into a plurality of code sections includes forming read-write data for the plurality of code sections in a shared read-write code section (see col. 5, lines 2-6, 17-21).

As to claims 5 and 7, Hutchison discloses the method further comprising: storing the symbol accessor code address in a first location in memory; in response to referencing the first location in memory, accessing the symbol accessor code; and, invoking the symbol accessor code to calculate the address of a sought symbol using a corresponding symbol identifier, and a corresponding code section identifier (see col. 6, line 9-21).

Regarding claims 33, 35-36, they are the corresponding device claims of method claims 1, 4 and 5. Therefore, claims 33, 35-36 are rejected for the same reason shown above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/917,026

Art Unit: 2687

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

Page 4

- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kuroda US 6,4571,74 B1.

As to claim 3, 6 and 8-9, Hutchison does not specifically disclose the method of arranging symbols to be offset from their respective code section start addresses; and the method further comprising: maintaining a symbol offset address table cross-referencing symbol identifiers with corresponding offset addresses, and corresponding code section identifiers. In an analogous art, Kuroda discloses the method of arranging symbols to be offset from their respective code section start addresses; and the method further comprising: maintaining a symbol offset address table cross-referencing symbol identifiers with corresponding offset addresses, and corresponding code section identifiers (see abstract), thereby permitting the use of relative address (offset that require only one bite) instead of absolute address (that require full four bytes).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add this technique to the Hutchison method for better management of the memory resources.

Regarding claims 34, 37-38, they are the corresponding device claims of method claims 3, 6 and 9. Therefore, claims 34, 37-38 are rejected for the same reason shown above.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be mailed to:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

571-273-8300

Art Unit: 2687

for formal communication intended for entry, informal communication or draft communication; in the case of informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcos L. Torres whose telephone number is 571-272-7926. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-6:00 PM alt. Wednesday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester G. Kincaid can be reached on 571-252-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marcos L Torres Examiner Art Unit 2687

SONNY TRINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER